

31761 118943257

CA 24N
H 4 40
- R25



Ministry of
Housing

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY MATERIAL

RENTAL MARKET SURVEY

in seven Ontario cities
October, 1980

POLICY AND PROGRAM
DEVELOPMENT SECRETARIAT

MARCH, 1981

CA26N
HF 40
- R25



Ministry of
Housing

RENTAL MARKET SURVEY

in seven Ontario cities
October, 1980

Hon. Claude Bennett
Minister of Housing

The Survey field work was
carried out by Complan
Research Associates Ltd.

Richard M. Dillon
Deputy Minister

Additional copies available from:
Ontario Government Bookstore
880 Bay St.
Toronto Ont.
Price: \$2.00 payable in advance
to the Treasurer of Ontario.

March, 1981

For information regarding the
contents of this report, please
contact:
Ms V. Parker
Policy and Program
Development Secretariat
(416) 965-7025

to premium
grades



Preparation of the 1980 Rental Market Survey:

Ms.V.Parker of the Policy and Program Development Secretariat co-ordinated the 1980 Rental Market Survey and wrote the report.

In addition, a number of staff assisted in the preparation of the report. Mr.T.Garrison provided technical advice in the survey design, Mrs.I.Kostir conducted the mail survey dealing with "movers" and Lindra Siutra assisted in the field operations and table preparation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
BACKGROUND	1
SUMMARY OF RESULTS	6
- Rent Increases	6
- Rent Levels	7
- Maintenance and Services	8
SECTION I	9
- RENT INCREASES	9
- Mover and Non-Mover Groups	9
- Comparison of Percent Rent Increases Among Cities	11
- Comparison of Rent Increases by Building Size and by Annual Household Income by City	12
- Comparison of Percent Rent Increase from October, 1978 to October, 1979 and for October, 1979 to October, 1980	13
- Comparison of Percent Rent Increase between Movers and Non-Movers by City (Mail Survey)	13
SECTION II	27
- RENT LEVELS	27
- Comparison of Rent Level - Averages and Distributions Among Cities	27
- Comparison of Rent Level Distributions by Bedroom Count and Building Size by City	27
- Comparison of Average Rent by Bedroom Count Between October, 1979 and October, 1980 (1979 and 1980 Rental Market Surveys)	28

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

	<u>PAGE</u>
SECTION III - MAINTENANCE AND SERVICE	40
- Comparison of Breakdown in Maintenance Systems among Cities	40
- Comparison of Breakdown in Maintenance Systems by Building Size and Annual Household Income	41
SECTION IV - TECHNICAL APPENDIX	46
- Study Population	46
- Sample Design	47
- Call Back Procedures	48
- Completion Rates	48
- Estimate Precision	49
- Precision of Average and Median Percent Rent Increases	50
- Comparison of Sample Statistics	51



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761118943257>

LIST OF TABLES

		<u>PAGE</u>
<u>SECTION I</u>		
<u>Rent Increases</u>		
1.1	Renter Mobility During the Period October 1979 to October 1980	16
1.2	Percent Non-Movers by Building Size October 1979 to October 1980	17
1.3	Distribution of Percent Rent Increase (Non-Movers)	18
1.4	Median and Average Percent Rent Increase Among Non-Movers October 1979 to October 1980	19
1.5	Percentage of Units with no Rent Increase by Building Size (Non-Movers)	20
1.6	Percent Rent Increase (Non-Movers) by Building Size	21
1.7	Percent Rent Increase (Non-Movers) by Annual Household Income	22
1.8	Percent Renting Same Unit/Different Unit (1979 and 1980 Rental Market Surveys)	23
1.9	Distribution of Percent Rent Increase (Non-Movers) Comparison of 1979 and 1980 Rental Market Surveys	24
1.10	Median and Average Percent Rent Increase (Non-Movers) (1979 and 1980 Rental Market Surveys)	25
1.11	Distribution and Median Rent Increase Between Movers and Non-Movers (Mail Survey)	26

LIST OF TABLES (CON'D)

		<u>PAGE</u>
<u>SECTION II</u>		
<u>Rent Levels</u>		
2.1	October 1980 Average Rents by Bedroom Count	31
2.2	October 1980 Rent Distrib- ution (All Units)	32
2.3A	Distribution of Rent by Bedroom Count	33
2.3B	Distribution of Rent by Bedroom Count	34
2.3C	Distribution of Rent by Bedroom Count	35
2.3D	Distribution of Rent by Bedroom Count	36
2.4	October 1980 Rent Distrib- ution by Building Size	37
2.5	Percent Change in Average October 1980 Rent and Average October 1979 Rent for Total Rental Stock (1979 and 1980 Rental Market Surveys)	38
2.6	Rent Level Distribution October 1979, October 1980 (1979 and 1980 Rental Market Surveys)	39
<u>SECTION III</u>		
<u>Maintenance and Services</u>		
3.1	Occurrence of Breakdowns to Some Major Systems - October '79 to October '80	43
3.2	Occurrence of Breakdowns in Maintenance Systems by Building Size	44
3.3	Occurrence of Breakdown in Maintenance Systems by Annual Household Income	45

	<u>PAGE</u>	
SECTION IV		
<u>Technical Appendix</u>		
4.1	Sample Sizes and Completion Rates	52
4.2	Approximate Precision of Percentage Estimates	53
4.3	October 1980 Average Rents by Bedroom Count with Descriptive Statistics	55
4.4	Sample Distribution by Bedroom Count	56
4.5	Sample Distribution by Building Size	57
4.6	Sample Distribution by Dwelling Type	58

RENTAL MARKET SURVEY IN
SEVEN ONTARIO CITIES - OCTOBER, 1980

Background

The Ministry of Housing first sponsored a Rental Market Survey in 1975, and the 1980 survey is the fifth in the series. Survey objectives and design have evolved continuously since 1975 with major design changes in 1977. The 1977 design became a mature survey with the addition of various refinements in 1978, 1979 and 1980. All surveys since 1977 can be considered as replications of the 1977 survey design. Therefore, statistics from all four surveys are comparable. Trends in rental markets can be examined in detail since 1977.

All analysis and statistics cited in this report are the work of the Policy and Program Development Secretariat staff. The Ministry is solely responsible for all conclusions and statistical quality. The 1980 survey was conducted by the consulting firm of Complan Research Associates Ltd. Complan Research conducted telephone interviews among random samples of all private rental households in seven Ontario cities: Hamilton, London, Ottawa, Sudbury, Thunder Bay, Metro Toronto and Windsor.

As in previous years the three objectives to the 1980 Rental Market Survey were:

1. To determine current rent levels in selected urban areas during October, 1980.
2. To determine annual rent changes incurred by individual households since October, 1979.
3. To determine tenant perceptions of building maintenance and services provided by landlords.

The 1980 survey has been expanded to better fulfill the third objective --- tenant perceptions of building maintenance. Previously, very 'soft' data on tenant perceptions of overall levels of maintenance were obtained. To refine the data on maintenance levels, revised questions were asked relating to such areas as elevator services, lights in public areas, heating and hotwater systems and leakages in walls, roof or ceiling. An open-ended question allowed respondents to identify other areas not already mentioned where repairs were required. Tenants were asked to identify specific occurrences of maintenance breakdowns in these areas rather than perceptions as to their level of satisfaction with maintenance and services.

Other refinements to the 1980 survey design included changes to the demographic data collected. Questions relating to income and household composition were expanded to provide more complete information. In prior surveys, grouped income levels had been asked rather than specific or actual income data. This hindered the type

of analysis possible. In addition, the questions relating to income were revised to reflect household income rather than personal income. Household income data provides a more accurate assessment of respondents rent-to-income ratio and thus, the household's ability to pay rent. Additional analysis in this area will be forthcoming in subsequent publications. In future surveys it may be possible to monitor changes or trends in rent-to-income ratios for tenant households in the cities surveyed.

Further, a minor refinement was made to the question relating to private market versus non-private market rents. An attempt was made to exclude all non-private market rents. This includes those receiving government subsidized rent and in certain cities, employees receiving low cost accommodation from their employers (more prominent in Northern Ontario).

As was done in the 1979 survey, statistical tables convey the statistical quality of results and indicate limitations which should be placed on interpretation. The limitations result from a survey design which called for the use of moderate sample sizes to control costs. Moderate sample sizes entail the possibility of sizeable sampling error, and consideration of sampling error cannot be ignored when evaluating survey results.

Survey estimates are seldom equal to true values, because not all units are measured. If two survey results are too close together, then they cannot be realistically treated as different numbers. For example, if sampling error is large, then an average percent rent increase of 7% in 1979 compared to a 1980 value of 5% may not be safely considered a reduction.

Sampling error is evaluated by formal tests, but presentation of test results is ponderous. However, presentation of statistics in table format invites comparison of the statistics across cities or some other criteria such as building size. Therefore, test results are conveyed by printing statistical tables in two different types. For all tables in the body of this report, statistics printed in *Italic* type indicate that the differences are too small to be considered genuine. Statistics that show stronger differences are printed in regular type face.

Many statistical tests can be calculated for each table, but only test results for the most basic level of comparison in a table can be indicated by the *Italics* convention. For example, Table 1.2 gives Percent Non-Movers by Building Size. The comparison is by building size

within cities. Only Toronto shows substantial differences between building sizes. Substantial differences across cities may or may not be present. Tables, titles and formats readily indicate whether the tested comparisons are within or across cities.

More detailed comparisons may be examined by referring to Tables 4.2 and 4.3 in the appendix. Table 4.2 gives the precision associated with various percentage estimates and sample sizes, while Table 4.3 gives precision associated with various averages. The precision of a statistical estimate is expressed as a plus or minus range around the sample statistic. The true value is almost certain to fall in that range. Values outside a range can be excluded as possible true values with near certainty.

The various statistics contained in this report have widely varying precision. Indicators of precision are provided in recognition of the widely varying uses of rent survey statistics.

This report provides an analysis of certain data collected in the October, 1980 survey and provides selected comparisons between 1979 and 1980 Rental Market Surveys. Survey results are presented in three sections: rent increases, rent levels and maintenance and services. A technical appendix follows Section III.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

I. Rent Increases

- Median percent rent increases ranged from 4.2% in Thunder Bay to 6.0% in Toronto (Table 1.4). However, most increases fell in two categories, no increase and near 6% increase. The distribution of increases suggests the impact of Rent Review (Table 1.3).
- Units in small buildings received lower median percent rent increases compared with units in larger buildings. This is largely due to the presence of a significantly larger proportion of no rent increase cases in small buildings (Tables 1.5, 1.6).
- No substantial difference in percent rent increases between high and low income tenants is evident (Table 1.7).
- No substantial differences in the distributions of percent rent increase from October, 1978 to October, 1979 and from October, 1979 to October, 1980 were present (Table 1.9). Typical percent rent increases were also unchanged (Table 1.10).

- Mail survey results indicated that percent rent increases were higher for movers (tenant moved between October, 1979 and October, 1980) in Hamilton, London and Sudbury. Toronto movers had lower percent rent increases than non-movers. However, substantial numbers of units with no rent increase were present among mover units in most cities. A genuine difference in average rents between movers and non-movers was exhibited in Sudbury only (Table 1.11).

II. Rent Levels

- Average rents, including separate charges, ranged from \$213 per month in Sudbury to \$315 per month in Toronto (Table 2.1).
- Over 70% of the units in Toronto cost over \$250 per month while over 70% of units in Sudbury cost less than \$250 per month (Table 2.2). This was especially true in the case of larger units (Table 2.3).
- Rent distributions by building size indicated genuine differences between large and small structures for most cities. (London and Ottawa were the exceptions).

- The annual rates of increase (between the 1979 and 1980 survey) for average rents range from -0.9% in Hamilton to 10.0% in Windsor (Table 2.5).

III. Maintenance and Services

- Less than 30% of cases reported any breakdown of maintenance systems. However, for those reporting breakdowns there was a genuine difference between cities for such breakdowns as lights in public areas, elevator services and heating and hot water systems (Table 3.1).
- Occurrence of breakdowns ranged generally around 2 to 3 times in the past year. Duration of breakdowns rarely lasted more than 2 or 3 days except in cases where leaks were identified.
- There were no apparent differences between structure sizes for breakdowns in heating or hot water systems. However, Toronto, London, and Ottawa showed significant differences between structure sizes with smaller structures reporting more cases of leaks in roof, ceiling or plaster (Table 3.2).
- No differences were observed in the number of cases reporting breakdowns between low and high income respondent groups (Table 3.3).

I. RENT INCREASES

Mover and Non-Movers Groups

The study population was all occupied private rental units with telephone service. The survey design includes units that are controlled by Rent Review and those units currently exempt from the Rent Review process.

Information was collected from both "mover" and "non-mover" households. "Non-mover" households are those households who occupied the 1980 survey unit in October, 1979, that is, they have lived in their current unit for a minimum of one year. "Mover" households, on the other hand have moved during the period October, 1979 to October, 1980. In view of this, it is not possible for mover households to provide reliable data on the October, 1979 rent for the 1980 survey unit.

Rent increase statistics provide measures of rent change for units, not for occupants. A very different survey design would be required to measure rent change for tenant households. The rent increase statistics presented in most of these tables deal with non-movers.

As a result, rent change statistics are calculated among relatively long-term residents (non-movers), and the statistics may be biased. The experience of long-term residents cannot be assumed to be representative of all renters.

No adequate methodology for identifying and contacting former tenants of units surveyed has been developed. To provide some data on mover households, a mail survey was utilized to contact present residents of units surveyed in the October 1979 survey. Present residents of units surveyed in October 1979 were asked to provide October 1980 rent. Rent change statistics among units where tenant moves have occurred are presented at the end of Section I.

The distribution of non-movers across cities and building size is important in the interpretation of rent increase statistics because most statistics are calculated among non-movers. If the distributions are not similar, then the statistics could be extremely biased. Tables 1.1 and 1.2 give the distribution of non-movers. Percent non-movers across cities ranged from 51.3% in London to 66.7% in Toronto. Distribution of non-movers across building size cannot be considered significant except for Toronto where the percentage of non-movers ranges from 57.3% in structures other than apartment buildings (i.e. singles,

row etc.) to 71.1% in apartment structures with greater than 20 units.

Comparison of Percent Rent Increases Among Cities

An overall difference in percent rent increases can be found among the cities. This difference is largely accounted for by the cities surveyed in Northern Ontario (i.e. Sudbury and Thunder Bay). Both Sudbury and Thunder Bay have a large proportion of cases (i.e. responses) in the 0% and less rent increase category. Toronto had the fewest cases in the no rent increase category at 16.9%, while at the other end of the scale Sudbury had 45.4% of cases with no rent increase.

Due the fact that most respondents fall into two widely separated categories (non-increase and 5.1-7.5%) averages, and to a lesser extent medians, fall in regions where few cases are present. For example, the Thunder Bay average increase for all units is 4.8% but only 10.3% of cases (Table 1.3) fall near the 4.8% average. Generally, the average is interpreted as a representation of the typical case, but that interpretation is not appropriate given the distribution of rent increases within cities. Medians are better representations of the typical case and are much more reliable.

When one excludes no rent increase cases, averages calculated among cases with rent increases are better estimators. Still, typical increases are not well represented. Only 11.5% of cases fell near the Toronto average increase

of 8.3% (rent increase cases only).

Close examination of Tables 1.3 and 1.4 indicates that rent increases of 6% were extremely typical, if medians* are interpreted as representing the typical case.

In all cities over 70% of cases have increases of approximately 6% or less (Table 1.3). Distributions would suggest the effects of Rent Review.**

The median percent increases for all units in which an increase took place (i.e. no increases excluded) range from 6.0% to 6.5%. When units with no rent increase are included, medians ranged from 5.2% to 6.0%, except for Sudbury (4.4%) and Thunder Bay (4.2%). Both Sudbury and Thunder Bay had a large number of cases in the zero rent increase category.

Comparison of Rent Increases by Building Size and by Annual Household Income by City.

Percent rent increase distributions by building size are presented in Table 1.5 and 1.6. Table 1.5 shows that strong differences in rent increase were present between small and large buildings.

* Medians are values such that 50% of cases fall below and 50% fall above the medians.

** Rent increases for units first occupied prior to 1976 are limited to 6%. Higher increases must go through the Rent Review process.

In each city:

- Small buildings had relatively more units in the no rent increase category than large buildings.
- Large buildings had relatively more units around 6% rent increase than small buildings.

The distribution of rent increase by household income is presented in Table 1.7. The distribution for low and high income families were remarkably similar in each city. There was no evidence that percent rent increase is related to income.

Comparison of Percent Rent Increase from October, 1978 to October, 1979 and for October, 1979 to October, 1980 by City.

Comparison of percent rent increase between October, 1978 to October, 1979 and October, 1979 to October, 1980 are presented in Tables 1.8, 1.9 and 1.10. The 1979 and 1980 percent rent increase results are remarkably similar. No genuine difference is demonstrated in the tables. Table 1.10 indicates there has been no substantial change in rent increases since October, 1979.

Comparison of Percent Rent Increase between Movers and Non-Movers by City (Mail Survey)

Information regarding rent increases for units when tenants move is not possible to obtain through the 1980

telephone survey. To provide information on mover households, a mail survey was conducted using the present occupants of units included in the 1979 Rental Market Survey. Current occupants of these units were asked to indicate their October 1980 rent and their date of occupancy. October 1979 rent was taken from the 1979 survey data file.

Comparison between mover and non-mover rent increase distributions, average rents and median increase is presented in Table 1.11.

A substantial difference between mover and non-mover median increase was present in Toronto, Hamilton, London and Sudbury. Movers tended to have higher incidences of rent increases above 7.5% for Hamilton, London and Sudbury. Toronto movers, on the other hand had substantially lower average and median increases than non-movers. This may be due to the fact that 20% of movers had experienced no rent increase compared to 12.2% no rent increase cases for non-movers. All cities show a substantial number of no increase cases for mover units ranging from 13.0% in Hamilton to 40.8% of movers in Windsor.

These differences are established with relatively small sample sizes and results must be used with some qualification. The survey was not able to contact all 1979 survey units due to insufficient addresses in a number of cases. Therefore, the sample cannot be considered representative of all tenant households in the cities surveyed.

Including 8.3% unuseable addresses, the response rate was 40% of 1979 survey units. This response rate should be used for general analysis only. The results must be taken to represent some unspecified group of renters.

Comparison of mail survey results between 1979 and 1980 are not presented. Survey design and survey instruments changed substantially between the two survey periods. These changes will not allow general comparisons between the 1980 and 1979 mail survey data.

TABLE 1.1
RENTER MOBILITY DURING THE PERIOD
OCTOBER 1979 TO OCTOBER 1980

Municipality	NON-MOVERS			MOVERS			Sample Size
	Rented Same Unit	Rent Different Unit Within Same City	Lived in Same City But Did Not Rent Oct '79	Lived in Same City Oct '79	Different City Oct '79	Total	
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	
Metro Toronto	66.7	15.6	6.6	11.1	100	765	
Hamilton	63.0	17.2	7.4	12.4	100	611	
London	51.3	22.8	8.1	17.8	100	729	
Windsor	56.1	21.7	11.7	10.5	100	742	
Ottawa	59.9	17.6	7.7	14.8	100	661	
Thunder Bay	53.3	23.6	10.7	12.4	100	737	
Sudbury	60.7	17.4	7.5	14.4	100	876	

TABLE 1.2
 PERCENT NON-MOVERS BY BUILDING SIZE
 OCTOBER 1979 TO OCTOBER 1980

Municipality	APARTMENT STRUCTURES				All Structures	
	Structures With 1 - 2 Units	Less Than 6 Units		More Than 20 Units		
		6 to 20 Units	More Than 20 Units			
Metro Toronto	57.3	61.5	61.2	71.1	66.7	
Hamilton	59.1	58.5	62.5	65.7	63.0	
London	50.8	47.3	41.9	54.7	51.3	
Windsor	54.1	50.0	63.0	58.7	56.1	
Ottawa	58.6	61.5	62.8	59.6	59.9	
Thunder Bay	55.3	46.6	53.5	56.8	53.3	
Sudbury	64.4	57.0	57.1	61.1	60.7	

NOTE: Statistics may differ slightly from Table 1.1 due to missing data.

TABLE 1.3

DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENT
RENT INCREASE (NON-MOVERS)

Municipality	Zero and Less <u>(%)</u>	0.1 <u>(%)</u>	2.6 <u>(%)</u>	5.1 <u>(%)</u>	7.6 <u>(%)</u>	10.1 <u>(%)</u>	15.1 <u>(%)</u>	Over 20.0 <u>(%)</u>	Total <u>(%)</u>	Sample Size
Metro Toronto	16.9	1.8	10.8	45.4	11.5	8.0	2.2	3.4	100.0	502
Hamilton	23.9	1.8	8.1	45.2	9.1	6.7	2.6	2.6	100.0	385
London	28.8	2.7	12.6	40.1	6.7	3.8	3.2	2.1	100.0	372
Windsor	39.9	1.9	7.7	30.5	7.7	6.5	2.9	2.9	100.0	414
Ottawa	23.8	3.1	13.3	39.6	9.7	5.1	3.3	2.1	100.0	391
Thunder Bay	41.7	2.6	10.3	26.5	8.7	5.4	1.5	3.3	100.0	389
Sudbury	45.4	1.5	6.6	23.8	8.1	7.6	4.2	2.8	100.0	529

TABLE 1.4

MEDIAN AND AVERAGE PERCENT
RENT INCREASE AMONG NON-MOVERS
OCTOBER 1979 TO OCTOBER 1980

Municipality	Median Percent Increase Among Units with Rent Increases	Median Percent Increase Among All Units **
Metro Toronto	6.2 (8.3)*	6.0 (6.9)*
Hamilton	6.1 (7.7)	5.9 (5.9)
London	6.0 (8.0)	5.6 (5.6)
Windsor	6.1 (8.9)	5.2 (5.3)
Ottawa	6.1 (8.0)	5.8 (6.0)
Thunder Bay	6.2 (8.6)	4.2 (4.8)
Sudbury	6.5 (10.1)	4.4 (5.3)

* Averages in brackets.

** Averages become extremely unstable with
the addition of zero increase cases.

TABLE 1.5

PERCENTAGE OF UNITS WITH NO RENT INCREASE
BY BUILDING SIZE (NON-MOVERS)

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>6 Units or More</u> (%)	<u>Less than 6 Units</u> (%)	<u>All Units</u> (%)
Metro Toronto	11.1	39.2	18.2
Hamilton	9.7	53.8	23.9
London	18.8	42.9	29.1
Windsor	24.9	54.4	40.1
Ottawa	10.6	40.2	24.8
Thunder Bay	15.6	57.1	42.2
Sudbury	24.7	56.9	45.7

NOTE: Statistics may differ slightly from Table 1.6
due to rounding procedures.

TABLE 1.6

PERCENT RENT INCREASE (NON-MOVERS)
BY BUILDING SIZE

Municipality	Building Size	Median						Sample Size
		Zero and Less	0.1 -2.5	2.6 -5.0	5.1 -7.5	7.6 -10.0	10.1 -15.0	
		(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	
Metro Toronto	Less than 6 units	38.3	0.8	10.1	25.8	12.5	3.9	3.1
	6 units or more	9.6	2.1	11.0	52.1	11.2	9.4	1.9
Hamilton	Less than 6 units	53.2	0.0	4.0	23.8	9.5	4.7	1.6
	6 units or more	9.7	2.7	10.0	55.6	8.9	7.7	3.1
London	Less than 6 units	42.5	1.9	9.4	30.0	5.6	6.2	1.9
	6 units or more	18.4	3.3	15.1	47.6	7.6	1.9	4.2
Windsor	Less than 6 units	54.2	0.0	5.6	21.0	7.0	6.1	3.3
	6 units or more	24.5	4.0	10.0	40.5	8.5	7.0	2.5
Ottawa	Less than 6 units	39.6	1.1	12.8	27.8	10.2	3.7	2.1
	6 units or more	9.3	4.9	13.7	50.5	9.3	6.4	4.4
Thunder Bay	Less than 6 units	56.6	2.4	8.9	13.3	7.6	5.2	2.0
	6 units or more	15.0	2.9	12.9	50.0	10.7	5.7	0.7
Sudbury	Less than 6 units	56.9	0.6	4.9	15.0	9.0	5.2	5.5
	6 units or more	23.5	3.3	9.9	40.4	6.6	12.0	1.6

NOTE: Statistics may differ slightly from Table 1.3 and 1.5 due to missing data.

TABLE 1.7

 PERCENT RENT INCREASE (NON-MOVERS)
 BY ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Municipality	Annual Household Income	Zero and		0.1		2.6		5.1		7.6		10.1		15.1		Over 20.0		Total (%)	Sample Size
		Less	(%)	-2.5	(%)	-5.0	(%)	-7.5	(%)	-10.0	(%)	-15.0	(%)	-20.0	(%)	-20.0	(%)		
Metro Toronto	Less than \$15,000 \$15,000 and over	19.6	2.2	9.8	50.0	10.9	3.2	1.1	3.2	100	92	9.2	225	9.2	225	9.2	225		
		14.7	2.2	11.1	46.7	12.4	7.6	1.8	7.6	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
Hamilton	Less than \$15,000 \$15,000 and over	23.0	3.3	4.4	47.3	11.0	5.5	3.3	2.2	100	91	9.1	142	9.1	142	9.1	142		
		23.9	1.4	7.8	48.6	8.5	5.6	2.8	1.4	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
London	Less than \$15,000 \$15,000 and over	29.6	3.7	14.8	38.3	3.7	3.7	3.7	2.5	100	81	8.1	142	8.1	142	8.1	142		
		28.2	4.2	13.4	39.4	8.5	5.6	0.0	0.7	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
Windsor	Less than \$15,000 \$15,000 and over	35.3	4.0	7.1	35.4	7.1	5.1	2.0	4.0	100	99	9.9	163	9.9	163	9.9	163		
		41.7	1.2	9.2	27.6	5.5	7.4	4.9	2.5	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
Ottawa	Less than \$15,000 \$15,000 and over	27.1	1.2	10.6	42.4	11.8	2.3	2.3	2.3	100	91	8.5	191	8.5	191	8.5	191		
		20.2	4.2	15.2	39.3	10.0	6.3	3.7	1.1	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
Thunder Bay	Less than \$15,000 \$15,000 and over	38.4	1.3	10.3	26.9	6.4	6.4	2.6	7.7	100	78	7.8	166	7.8	166	7.8	166		
		44.6	1.8	12.7	23.5	10.2	4.2	0.6	2.4	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
Sudbury	Less than \$15,000 \$15,000 and over	49.6	1.4	3.5	23.4	8.3	5.5	3.5	4.8	100	145	14.5	207	14.5	207	14.5	207		
		47.3	1.9	8.7	19.3	9.2	6.3	5.8	1.5	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		

NOTE: Sample sizes may differ slightly from Table 1.3 due to missing data.

TABLE 1.8

PERCENT RENTING SAME UNIT/DIFFERENT UNIT
(1979 AND 1980 RENTAL MARKET SURVEYS)

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>October 1979</u>		<u>October 1978</u>	
	<u>To October 1980</u>	<u>Same Unit</u> (%)	<u>To October 1979</u>	<u>Different Unit</u> (%)
Metro Toronto	67	33	64	36
Hamilton	63	37	63	37
London	51	49	51	49
Windsor	56	44	53	47
Ottawa	60	40	60	40
Thunder Bay	53	47	51	49
Sudbury	61	39	59	41

NOTES: Statistics may differ slightly from Table 1.1
due to rounding procedures.

The Italics indicate statistical test results for comparisons
among the cities. The 1979-1980 and 1978-1979 differences
within particular cities were not substantial.

TABLE 1.9

DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENT RENT INCREASE (NON-MOVERS)
COMPARISON OF 1979 AND 1980 RENTAL MARKET SURVEYS

Municipality	Survey Year	Over 20.0% (n)						Sample Size			
		15.1% (n)			-20.0% (n)						
		Zero and Less	0.1 - 2.5%	2.6 - 5.0%	5.1 - 7.5%	7.6 - 10.0%	10.1 - 15.0%				
Metro Toronto	1980	16.9	1.8	10.8	45.4	11.5	8.0	2.2	3.4	100	502
	1979	19.1	2.3	11.9	43.9	8.3	9.8	3.0	1.7	100	471
Hamilton	1980	23.9	1.8	8.1	45.2	9.1	6.7	2.6	2.6	100	385
	1979	23.8	2.0	14.9	41.0	7.2	7.4	1.1	2.6	100	349
London	1980	28.8	2.7	12.6	40.1	6.7	3.8	3.2	2.1	100	372
	1979	33.3	1.9	11.6	38.1	7.8	5.7	1.4	0.5	100	424
Windsor	1980	39.9	1.9	7.7	30.5	7.7	6.5	2.9	2.9	100	414
	1979	33.0	1.4	10.3	38.0	6.2	7.3	1.9	1.9	100	370
Ottawa	1980	23.8	3.1	13.3	39.6	9.7	5.1	3.3	2.1	100	391
	1979	22.2	3.9	12.5	41.9	8.5	5.5	2.3	3.2	100	433
Thunder Bay	1980	41.7	2.6	10.3	26.5	8.7	5.4	1.5	3.3	100	389
	1979	40.7	0.8	14.1	23.4	9.6	6.8	2.3	2.3	100	397
Sudbury	1980	45.4	1.5	6.6	23.8	8.1	7.6	4.2	2.8	100	529
	1979	62.2	1.3	6.9	15.9	4.3	5.0	0.9	3.5	100	540

TABLE 1.10

MEDIAN AND AVERAGE PERCENT RENT INCREASE (NON-MOVERS)
(1979 AND 1980 RENTAL MARKET SURVEYS)

Municipality	October 1979 to October 1980		October 1978 to October 1979	
	Median Percent Increase Among Units with Rent Increase	Median Percent Increase Among All Units **	Median Percent Increase Among Units with Rent Increase	Median Percent Increase Among All Units **
Metro Toronto	6.2 (8.3)*	6.0 (6.9)	6.2 (8.0)	5.9 (6.3)
Hamilton	6.1 (7.7)	5.9 (5.9)	6.0 (8.1)	5.6 (6.1)
London	6.0 (8.0)	5.6 (5.6)	6.0 (6.7)	5.3 (4.5)
Windsor	6.1 (8.9)	5.2 (5.3)	6.1 (7.6)	5.5 (5.1)
Ottawa	6.1 (8.0)	5.8 (6.0)	6.0 (7.7)	5.6 (5.9)
Thunder Bay	6.2 (8.6)	4.2 (4.8)	6.2 (8.0)	4.0 (4.6)
Sudbury	6.5 (10.1)	4.4 (5.3)	6.3 (9.3)	0.3 (3.4)

* Averages in brackets.

** Averages become extremely unstable with the addition of zero increase cases.

NOTE: The Italics indicate statistical test results for comparisons between 1979 - 1980 and 1978 - 1979 differences in individual cities. Table 1.4 indicates 1979 - 1980 test results among the cities. No genuine differences between the two survey periods was exhibited.

TABLE 1.11

DISTRIBUTION AND MEDIAN RENT INCREASE
BETWEEN MOVERS AND NON-MOVERS
(MAIL SURVEY)

Municipality	Zero And Less (%)	Oct./79-			Oct./80			Sample Size									
		-2.5 (%)	0.1 (%)	2.6 (%)	-5.0 (%)	5.1 (%)	-7.5 (%)	-10.0 (%)	-15.0 (%)	10.1 (%)	-20.0 (%)	15.1 (%)	-20.0 (%)	Over 20.0 (%)	Total (%)	Oct./80 Avg. Rent (\$)	Oct./79- Oct./80 Median Increase (%)
Metro Toronto																	
- Non-Movers	12.2	2.6	12.2	49.5	9.6	7.0	2.6	4.3	100	307	6.0	(7.3)*	230				
- Movers	20.0	11.4	14.3	27.1	8.6	10.0	2.9	8.7	100	300	5.8	(6.4)	70				
Hamilton																	
- Non-Movers	16.0	3.8	11.0	53.4	4.9	7.1	2.7	1.1	100	250	5.8	(6.1)	182				
- Movers	13.0	1.3	18.2	25.9	16.9	11.7	9.1	3.9	100	260	6.2	(8.6)	77				
London																	
- Non-Movers	22.4	3.5	15.8	46.9	5.7	3.1	0.4	2.2	100	259	5.8	(5.7)	228				
- Movers	23.4	3.6	16.8	21.9	10.2	8.8	4.4	10.9	100	267	5.9	(8.8)	137				
Windsor																	
- Non-Movers	27.5	3.2	10.6	38.0	3.2	10.1	4.8	2.6	100	259	5.9	(6.7)	189				
- Movers	40.8	4.9	7.4	12.4	4.9	11.1	6.2	12.3	100	257	5.3	(6.9)	81				
Ottawa																	
- Non-Movers	18.2	6.7	18.2	38.6	6.7	6.2	1.8	3.6	100	309	5.8	(7.3)	225				
- Movers	22.0	9.3	12.7	29.7	3.4	10.2	6.8	5.9	100	317	5.7	(7.0)	118				
Thunder Bay																	
- Non-Movers	29.2	2.8	17.0	30.7	6.6	3.8	4.7	5.2	100	268	5.6	(7.3)	212				
- Movers	29.4	2.9	19.0	18.1	10.5	4.8	8.6	6.7	100	305	5.5	(7.1)	105				
Sudbury																	
- Non-Movers	39.0	3.5	7.0	25.2	5.7	10.9	2.6	6.1	100	219	5.6	(6.9)	230				
- Movers	19.4	2.6	16.9	15.6	13.0	19.5	2.6	10.4	100	238	6.5	(9.4)	77				

* Average increase (all units) are in brackets.

II. RENT LEVELS

Comparison of Rent Levels - Averages and Distributions Among Cities

Table 2.1 and 2.2 present average rent levels by bedroom count and rent distribution among cities. Average rents for all units vary considerably from city to city from \$213 in Sudbury to \$315 in Toronto. Toronto and Ottawa have consistently higher rents in 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. Higher rents are not unusual for the larger cities considering the differences in markets among the cities surveyed.

Distribution of rents in Table 2.2 indicates substantial differences between cities. For example, over 70% of cases in Sudbury have rents of less than \$250 while over 70% of the cases in Toronto have rents higher than \$250.

Comparison of Rent Level Distributions by Bedroom Count and Building Size by City

Table 2.3 gives the distribution of rent levels by bedroom count for each city. It can be seen that some unit types represent a very small percentage of the total private rental stock. For example, moderately priced (less than \$300 per month) three-bedroom units comprise only 15.8% of all three-bedroom units in Toronto compared to 31.1% for Ottawa and 77.9% for Sudbury.

The availability of moderately priced family units (3 bedroom) seems to be in limited supply for places such as Toronto, and to a lesser extent Ottawa.

Table 2.4 gives rent level distributions and average rents by building size. Differences in rent level distributions by building size are substantial in most cities (exceptions being London and Ottawa). In general, the largest proportion of low to moderate priced rents are in small buildings. However, in Toronto and Ottawa there are a number of units in the small buildings in the over \$450 per month rent category. These units tend to inflate the averages for less than 6 units (i.e. small) structures.

In the two largest cities, Toronto and Ottawa, small building rents tend to occupy the low and high end of the rent spectrum, while large buildings occupy the middle range.

Comparison of Average Rent by Bedroom Count Between October 1979 and October 1980 (1979 and 1980 Rental Market Surveys)

Average rent levels by bedroom count for the 1979 and 1980 surveys are presented in Table 2.5. The 1979 to 1980 percent change in average October rent are substantial for all bedroom counts in Toronto and Windsor only.

Average rent increase between the two survey periods was not substantial in the majority of other cases. However, when considering average rents for all units, only Thunder Bay and Hamilton did not demonstrate substantial increases between the 1979 and 1980 rent surveys. Average rents increased from - 0.9% in Hamilton to 10.0% in Windsor. Negative increases in Table 2.5 fall within an acceptable range of precision, that is the true value of the average rent for 1980 falls between \$226.29 and \$237.71, while the true value for the 1979 average rent falls between \$228.50 and \$239.50. The percent increase between the two survey periods ranges from +3.9% to -5.8%.

The percent change statistics in Table 2.5 are provided to enable quick comparisons of the rates of change among cities. The comparison is at the city level, and statistics do not represent average rent increases faced by the individual tenant. The percent change statistics can not be used as a substitute for average rent increases among both movers and non-movers. Many factors can combine to create situations where the present change in average rent levels from year to year is greatly different

than average individual rent change. For example, luxury units coming on the market can greatly increase percent change in average levels but have no impact on individual rent change as there were no prior tenants.

Table 2.6 indicates that substantive changes for distribution of rents between survey periods occurred in Toronto, London and Windsor.

TABLE 2.1

OCTOBER 1980 AVERAGE RENTS*
BY BEDROOM COUNT

Municipality	1 Bedroom (\$)	2 Bedroom (\$)	3 Bedroom (\$)	All Units (\$)
Metro Toronto	275	338	421	315 ± 7.85
Hamilton	204	239	282	232 ± 5.71
London	219	269	300	257 ± 5.93
Windsor	226	269	284	253 ± 6.38
Ottawa	253	297	344	295 ± 7.39
Thunder Bay	225	281	300	262 ± 6.49
Sudbury	186	214	245	213 ± 4.77

NOTE: The precision of averages for 1, 2, and 3 bedroom units is much less than precision stated for all units. See Table 4.3 for detail.

* All units.

TABLE 2.2

OCTOBER 1980 RENT DISTRIBUTION
(ALL UNITS)

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>To \$150</u> (%)	<u>\$151</u> <u>-200</u> (%)	<u>\$201</u> <u>-225</u> (%)	<u>\$226</u> <u>-250</u> (%)	<u>\$251</u> <u>-275</u> (%)	<u>\$276</u> <u>-300</u> (%)	<u>\$301</u> <u>-350</u> (%)	<u>\$351</u> <u>-450</u> (%)	<u>\$450</u> (%)	<u>Total</u> (%)	<u>Sample</u> <u>Size</u>
Metro Toronto	5.0	6.0	6.3	10.2	9.5	14.7	19.5	19.8	9.0	100	764
Hamilton	11.1	20.3	15.4	20.4	10.8	9.8	8.7	3.3	0.2	100	611
London	6.2	17.5	11.4	16.5	14.9	11.7	14.0	6.4	1.4	100	729
Windsor	10.1	22.9	7.4	12.7	9.8	12.7	14.3	8.5	1.6	100	742
Ottawa	5.6	8.6	8.3	12.6	11.3	10.9	19.7	18.5	4.5	100	661
Thunder Bay	13.7	13.5	6.5	11.0	9.9	13.2	17.0	14.4	0.8	100	736
Sudbury	20.5	30.6	10.7	13.4	6.7	6.9	7.2	3.9	0.1	100	875

NOTE: Sample sizes may differ slightly from Table 1.1
due to missing data.

TABLE 2.3A

DISTRIBUTION OF RENT BY BEDROOM COUNT

October 1980 Rent	METRO TORONTO			HAMILTON		
	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)
To \$150	3.1	2.7	2.1	12.7	7.2	6.8
\$151 - 200	9.3	2.7	1.1	28.1	17.1	8.0
\$201 - 225	10.0	1.4	2.1	23.7	12.0	6.8
\$226 - 250	15.6	6.1	4.2	25.4	22.7	10.2
\$251 - 275	14.5	6.4	2.1	6.6	17.9	6.8
\$276 - 300	17.7	16.3	4.2	2.2	14.3	17.0
\$301 - 350	17.3	29.8	9.5	1.3	6.8	33.0
\$351 - 450	11.1	26.1	40.0	0.0	2.0	11.4
\$451 +	1.4	8.5	34.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100
Sample Size	289	295	95	228	251	88

TABLE 2.3B

DISTRIBUTION OF RENT BY BEDROOM COUNT

October 1980 Rent	LONDON			WINDSOR		
	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)
To \$150	9.2	2.9	1.7	12.3	8.3	4.0
\$151 - 200	26.8	10.3	11.2	27.2	20.1	15.9
\$201 - 225	16.3	11.9	4.3	8.3	6.2	6.4
\$226 - 250	25.1	14.8	8.6	15.9	10.1	15.1
\$251 - 275	11.7	21.6	7.8	15.6	6.2	7.9
\$276 - 300	7.5	15.4	13.8	9.8	16.7	12.7
\$301 - 350	3.4	17.7	30.2	8.3	18.8	19.8
\$351 - 450	0.0	4.8	21.5	1.8	11.5	17.5
\$451 +	0.0	0.6	0.9	0.8	2.1	0.8
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100
Sample Size	239	311	276	288	126	

TABLE 2.3C

DISTRIBUTION OF RENT BY BEDROOM COUNT

October 1980 Rent	OTTAWA			THUNDER BAY		
	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)
To \$150	4.7	3.4	3.3	16.4	6.6	15.6
\$151 - 200	11.5	6.4	6.6	20.6	8.4	7.5
\$201 - 225	12.1	5.9	5.3	7.5	7.7	4.1
\$226 - 250	19.9	13.2	4.6	16.8	10.8	2.7
\$251 - 275	20.9	9.3	5.3	16.4	9.4	3.4
\$276 - 300	12.6	14.4	6.0	12.6	16.8	10.2
\$301 - 350	15.7	27.5	21.2	8.0	25.5	19.7
\$351 - 450	2.6	17.8	38.4	1.7	14.4	35.4
\$451 +	0.0	2.1	9.3	0.0	0.4	1.4
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100
Sample Size	191	236	151	238	286	147

TABLE 2.3D

DISTRIBUTION OF RENT BY BEDROOM COUNT

October 1980 Rent	SUDBURY		
	1 Bedroom (%)	2 Bedroom (%)	3 Bedroom (%)
To \$150	31.9	16.3	12.2
\$151 - 200	36.1	33.6	20.2
\$201 - 225	10.3	10.7	10.1
\$226 - 250	9.5	14.1	17.0
\$251 - 275	5.7	9.6	4.3
\$276 - 300	3.4	5.6	14.4
\$301 - 350	1.9	6.4	16.0
\$351 - 450	1.2	3.7	5.8
\$451 +	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total (%)	100	100	100
Sample Size	263	375	188

TABLE 2.4

OCTOBER 1980 RENT DISTRIBUTION
BY BUILDING SIZE

Municipality	Building Size	To \$150 (%)	\$201 (%)	\$226 (%)	\$251 (%)	\$276 (%)	\$301 (%)	\$351 (%)	Over \$450 (%)	Total (%)	Average Rent (\$)	Sample Size
Metro	-Less than 6 units	12.2	11.7	10.0	9.5	6.8	10.4	7.7	14.5	17.2	100	311
Toronto	-6 units or more	2.0	3.7	4.8	10.5	10.7	16.4	24.3	21.9	5.7	100	317
Hamilton	-Less than 6 units	21.5	28.5	7.0	8.4	7.0	7.0	13.6	6.5	0.5	100	226
	-6 units or more	5.5	15.9	19.9	27.0	12.9	11.3	6.0	1.5	0.0	100	234
London	-Less than 6 units	9.3	21.1	10.6	10.3	9.6	8.4	18.3	9.6	2.8	100	264
	-6 units or more	3.7	14.7	12.0	21.4	19.2	14.3	10.6	3.9	0.2	100	251
Windsor	-Less than 6 units	14.5	30.0	7.9	13.0	6.9	9.0	10.6	7.1	1.0	100	235
	-6 units or more	4.8	14.3	6.9	12.2	13.4	17.0	18.8	10.2	2.4	100	275
Ottawa	-Less than 6 units	9.1	12.3	9.1	10.1	6.6	7.2	13.2	25.5	6.9	100	299
	-6 units or more	2.3	5.2	7.6	14.9	15.7	14.3	25.7	12.0	2.3	100	291
Thunder Bay	-Less than 6 units	15.6	16.4	7.5	11.8	8.1	11.4	12.2	16.0	1.0	100	258
	-6 units or more	10.2	7.9	4.7	9.5	13.4	16.5	26.0	11.4	0.4	100	271
Sudbury	-Less than 6 units	25.9	36.3	10.4	9.6	3.0	5.7	6.2	2.7	0.2	100	201
	-6 units or more	10.6	20.3	11.2	20.3	13.5	9.0	9.0	6.1	0.0	100	237

NOTE: Statistics may differ slightly from Table 2.2
due to missing data.

TABLE 2.5

PERCENT CHANGE IN AVERAGE OCTOBER 1980 RENT
AND AVERAGE OCTOBER 1979 RENT FOR TOTAL RENTAL STOCK
(1979 AND 1980 RENTAL MARKET SURVEYS)

Municipality	1 Bedroom			2 Bedroom			3 Bedroom			All Units		
	Avg. Rent Oct/79	Avg. Rent Oct/80		Percent Change	Avg. Rent Oct/79	Avg. Rent Oct/80		Percent Change	Avg. Rent Oct/79	Avg. Rent Oct/80		Percent Change
		Avg.	Rent Oct/80			Avg.	Rent Oct/80			Avg.	Rent Oct/80	
Metro Toronto	254	275	+8.3		305	338	+10.8		370	421	+13.8	
Hamilton	197	204	+3.4		245	239	-2.4		297	282	-5.1	
London	210	219	+4.3		250	269	+7.6		294	300	+2.0	
Windsor	215	226	+5.1		244	269	+10.2		256	284	+10.9	
Ottawa	250	253	+1.2		290	297	+2.4		328	344	+4.9	
Thunder Bay	215	225	+4.7		271	281	+3.7		311	300	-3.6	
Sudbury	182	186	+2.2		207	214	+3.4		238	245	+2.9	

TABLE 2.6

**RENT LEVEL DISTRIBUTION
OCTOBER 1979, OCTOBER 1980
(1979 AND 1980 RENTAL MARKET SURVEYS)**

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Survey Period</u>	To	\$151	\$201	\$251	\$301	Over \$350	Total	<u>Sample Size</u>
		\$150 (%)	-200 (%)	-250 (%)	-300 (%)	-350 (%)	(%)	(%)	
Metro Toronto	-Oct. 1980	5.0	6.0	16.5	24.2	19.5	28.8	100	764
	-Oct. 1979	3.9	9.9	22.5	26.1	18.8	18.8	100	739
Hamilton	-Oct. 1980	11.1	20.3	35.8	20.6	8.7	3.5	100	671
	-Oct. 1979	9.4	24.1	33.2	19.0	9.3	5.0	100	562
London	-Oct. 1980	6.2	17.5	27.9	26.6	14.0	7.8	100	729
	-Oct. 1979	7.5	19.7	35.7	20.5	10.9	5.7	100	841
Windsor	-Oct. 1980	10.1	22.9	20.1	22.5	14.3	10.1	100	742
	-Oct. 1979	15.0	35.3	26.4	19.0	9.8	4.5	100	712
Ottawa	-Oct. 1980	5.6	8.6	20.9	22.2	19.7	23.0	100	661
	-Oct. 1979	3.7	12.9	22.0	25.2	16.8	19.4	100	722
Thunder Bay	-Oct. 1980	13.7	13.5	17.5	23.1	17.0	15.2	100	736
	-Oct. 1979	11.3	16.4	19.0	27.3	14.7	11.3	100	790
Sudbury	-Oct. 1980	20.5	30.6	24.1	13.6	7.2	4.0	100	875
	-Oct. 1979	22.4	30.4	26.0	14.1	4.8	2.3	100	917

NOTES: Statistics may differ slightly from Table 2.2 due to rounding procedures.

III. MAINTENANCE AND SERVICE

Comparison of Breakdown in Maintenance Systems among Cities

In previous surveys very "soft" data was collected regarding tenant perceptions of general level of maintenance. This area of the survey was refined in 1980 to provide more concrete data on maintenance and the type of maintenance problems which exist in the private rental market.

Questions relating to maintenance asked whether:

- any elevators had been out of service for 6 or more hours in the past year.
- lights in public areas have worked properly.
- the regular heating or hot/water system broke down for 6 hours or more during the past year.
- any walls, roof or ceiling of the building have leaked during the past year.
- any other items need repair.

For those areas where a breakdown in the system was identified, the frequency and duration of longest occurrence was asked.

In general, Table 3.1 indicates there are genuine differences between cities in the areas of elevators, lights and heat/hot water systems. Toronto had the

highest proportion of elevator breakdowns with 29.8% of cases reporting a system breakdown for 6 or more hours, while in Thunder Bay only 8.2% of cases reported a breakdown in the elevator system. The difference in proportions may be related to the number and age of highrise structures in the Northern communities in comparison to larger cities. There was no substantial difference among cities for the frequency of occurrences in the past year for any maintenance system breakdown. In general, in all cities some lights were out in public areas 2 to 3 times in past year and most breakdowns lasted an average of 1 to 3 days.

Other items which required repair included such things as repairs to kitchen appliances and cracks in plaster, ceilings or floors. However, responses were so small in absolute numbers for all categories that a detailed table was not warranted. Repairs to 'utilities' tended to be the most frequent response group in all cities. Utilities included such things as plumbing, electrical and heating systems.

Comparison of Breakdown in Maintenance Systems by Building and Annual Household Income

Table 3.2 indicates genuine differences between building sizes occurred only in London, Toronto and Ottawa. In these cities leaks tended to occur more often in small

buildings. No other trends were apparent. Comparisons by building size for elevator breakdowns and occurrence of lights out in public areas was not possible as questions relating to these two areas were asked of larger buildings only (i.e. over 20 units in structure). There would appear to be no relationship between household income and problems related to maintenance systems. No substantial differences could be found in the data.

TABLE 3.1

OCCURENCE OF BREAKDOWNS TO SOME
MAJOR SYSTEMS - OCTOBER' 79 TO OCTOBER' 80

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>System</u>	Break- Down in System *	Freq. of Occurrence (Median)	Longest Occurrence (Median) (Days)
Metro Toronto	Elevators	29.8	N/A	N/A
	Lights (Public Area)	6.6	3	2
	Heat	10.0	2	1
	Leaks-Repaired	8.2	N/A	5
	-Attempt Made	4.3	N/A	180
Hamilton	Elevators	26.4	N/A	N/A
	Lights (Public Area)	9.7	3.5	1
	Heat	7.4	1	1
	Leaks-Repaired	8.8	N/A	13
	-Attempt Made	6.4	N/A	365
London	Elevators	13.7	N/A	N/A
	Lights (Public Area)	5.6	3.5	3
	Heat	4.7	1	2
	Leaks-Repaired	8.5	N/A	6
	-Attempt Made	5.8	N/A	186
Windsor	Elevators	15.6	N/A	N/A
	Lights (Public Area)	4.4	2.5	3
	Heat	4.7	1	2
	Leaks-Repaired	7.0	N/A	4.5
	-Attempt Made	6.3	N/A	248
Ottawa	Elevators	22.6	N/A	N/A
	Lights (Public Area)	2.3	2	1
	Heat	7.6	1	1
	Leaks-Repaired	7.7	N/A	7
	-Attempt Made	5.4	N/A	202
Thunder Bay	Elevators	8.2	N/A	N/A
	Lights (Public Area)	6.9	2.5	3
	Heat	3.8	1	2
	Leaks-Repaired	7.4	N/A	3
	-Attempt Made	8.0	N/A	155
Sudbury	Elevators	11.8	N/A	N/A
	Lights (Public Area)	7.8	2	2
	Heat	5.4	1	1
	Leaks-Repaired	11.0	N/A	7
	-Attempt Made	5.9	N/A	188

NOTE: Sample sizes may differ from other tables
due to missing data.

* Proportion of respondents indicating a break-
down in the maintenance system.

TABLE 3.2

OCCURENCE OF BREAKDOWNS IN MAINTENANCE SYSTEMS BY BUILDING SIZE

Municipality	Building Size	Heat/Hot Water System Down		Leaks (%)	(Sample Size)
		(%)	(Sample Size)		
Metro Toronto	Less than 6 units	12.2	221	20.8	216
	6 units or more	29.0	544	13.9	517
Hamilton	Less than 6 units	14.0	214	22.4	210
	6 units or more	20.4	397	17.8	388
London	Less than 6 units	9.9	322	22.2	316
	6 units or more	8.1	407	12.7	393
Windsor	Less than 6 units	9.8	407	17.9	397
	6 units or more	7.8	335	14.6	322
Ottawa	Less than 6 units	13.2	318	19.5	313
	6 units or more	14.6	343	13.1	337
Thunder Bay	Less than 6 units	8.9	483	18.6	473
	6 units or more	11.4	254	16.3	245
Sudbury	Less than 6 units	10.8	564	20.0	550
	6 units or more	17.6	312	19.1	304

NOTE: Sample sizes may differ from other tables due to missing data.

TABLE 3.3

OCCURENCE OF BREAKDOWN IN MAINTENANCE SYSTEMS BY ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Municipality	Income	Elevators (%)	Elevators (Sample Size)	Lights Out in Public Areas (%)	Lights Out in Public Areas (Sample Size)	Heat/Hot Water System Down (%)	Heat/Hot Water System Down (Sample Size)	Leaks (%)	Leaks (Sample Size)
Metro Toronto	Less than \$15,000	33.0	69	10.0	80	24.2	149	20.7	145
	\$15,000 and over	29.2	192	8.7	208	23.8	336	17.1	327
Hamilton	Less than \$15,000	24.7	73	8.3	84	20.3	153	21.3	150
	\$15,000 and over	29.7	111	16.7	120	21.4	224	18.6	220
London	Less than \$15,000	18.8	64	9.2	87	6.3	174	19.8	167
	\$15,000 and over	15.5	84	8.4	107	10.4	240	15.2	237
Windsor	Less than \$15,000	8.3	36	2.0	49	10.7	187	13.3	181
	\$15,000 and over	21.5	65	9.4	85	8.2	293	17.5	286
Ottawa	Less than \$15,000	21.4	56	1.6	62	15.5	142	16.7	138
	\$15,000 and over	23.8	101	7.1	112	14.9	317	19.0	311
Thunder Bay	Less than \$15,000	18.2	11	10.8	37	12.3	146	13.6	140
	\$15,000 and over	4.2	24	6.0	50	11.6	303	21.7	300
Sudbury	Less than \$15,000	13.5	37	12.0	50	15.6	243	16.8	238
	\$15,000 and over	10.3	39	13.5	52	14.8	329	23.1	325

NOTE: Sample sizes may differ from other tables due to missing data.

IV. TECHNICAL APPENDIX

The 1980 Rental Market Survey Report is based on an analysis of data from 5,121 interviews in seven Ontario cities. Table 4.1 indicates the number of completed interviews and completion rates in each surveyed city. Telephone interviews were conducted during October, 1980 by Complan Research Associates from their central telephone facilities in Toronto. Interviewers were selected, trained and supervised specifically for the survey. In addition, the survey method and questionnaire were almost identical to the 1977 and 1978 surveys. Both interviewers and supervisors were given extensive training in the area of questionnaires, refusal handling, language problems and call back procedures.

Study Population

The desired study population was all private rental units in the seven cities surveyed. However, the survey design produced a survey population that is conceptually different than the study population. Differences are:

- The survey population is rental households rather than rental units, because a household member must respond to the survey. All respondents are male or female heads of households. Vacant units cannot be surveyed.

- Surveyed units must also have a telephone identified with a single rental unit, and a respondent available and willing to be surveyed. All telephones in rooming houses are excluded for this reason.
- The survey population includes some households outside the identified cities, because telephone exchanges are selected from directories. The exchanges do not necessarily follow municipal boundaries.
- Interviews were undertaken in English, French and Italian.

The survey method undoubtedly underrepresents some groups, such as rooming house residents. However, survey results should not be appreciably biased. Sample representation of various groups can be judged from Tables 4.4 to 4.6.

Sample Design

A random probability sample of telephone directory numbers is drawn by systematic selection. The last digit of telephone numbers is increased by a constant so unlisted numbers are included in the sample. Small sub-samples are taken by systematic selection and released for processing. Sub-samples are taken and processed until a desired sample size of completed interviews is achieved. However, once a sub-sample is released for processing, the entire sub-sample is processed.

The sample design is more economical to execute than computer generated random numbers. Computer generated numbers contain a much greater percentage of unusable

numbers, and more interview time is required. However, the sample population reflects the distribution of renter telephone exchanges rather than the true geographical distribution of renters. Only minor distortions are likely to result due to sample design, and cost advantages outweigh statistical considerations.

Call Back Procedures

All telephone numbers were tried at least once during weekday working hours. Non-answering numbers were allotted nine call-backs distributed across various times and days. Evening and Saturday morning interviewing times were included. Individual numbers could receive up to 27 call-backs if numbers are alternately busy and non-answering. Refusals were recontacted by specially trained interviewers.

Completion Rates

A total of 30,962 telephone numbers were sampled.

Of the total:	30,962
8,796 numbers were unusable (non-working, non-residential, etc.).	22,166
13,574 numbers did not qualify (owners, government subsidized rent, etc.)	8,592
3,467 numbers were non-completions. (Refusals, language problems, not at home, etc.) Within the non completion group, 1,870 numbers were estimated to be non-qualifiers, such as owners.	5,126

The overall completion rate was 76.3% (5,126 completions divided by 6,722 sampled rental units). Rates in individual cities ranged from 66.2% in Toronto to 82.2% in Sudbury. These rates include an adjustment for the number of non-qualifiers where tenure status could not be determined.

Estimate Precision

All statistics in the report were derived from a sample of all rental units. Reported statistics will vary somewhat from the true values obtained if all units were measured. Consequently, sample statistics are better interpreted as ranges of probable values. The ranges are calculated as the sample statistics plus and minus some value.

The ranges are interpreted as a set of values that is almost certain to contain the true value*, and estimate precision is nothing more than the width of the range. Sample statistics from the centre of ranges, even if the values are near the sample statistics, are no better estimates of true values than values near the end of ranges.

* The technical term is confidence interval, and all ranges reported are calculated to 95%. A 5% chance that true values fall outside ranges is present. If a 10% risk of error is acceptable, the ranges would be slightly narrower.

For example, a decision may depend on whether average rents in Hamilton reached \$230. The sample average is \$232 but \$230 is included in the precision range. \$226.3 is the lower bound, and \$229 is as good an estimate of the true average as \$232. The sample statistic does not have enough precision to determine if Hamilton average rents are less than or greater than \$230 unless a large risk of error is accepted.

Table 4.2 gives the precision associated with percentage estimates found in the report, and Table 4.3 gives the precision of average rent levels by bedroom count.

Precision of Average and Median Percent Rent Increases

The precision of medians can be stated only in special conditions. Generally the precision is very high when medians fall in areas where a high density of cases exists. Only Sudbury and Thunder Bay show medians in areas where a relatively low proportion of cases exists.

The precision for average percent rent increases including zero increase cases should not be considered. The precision is extremely low. The precision of averages including no increase cases is generally less than $\pm 0.5\%$.

Comparison of Sample Statistics

Appropriate tests were calculated, and generally the terms "substantial difference or genuine difference" used in the text indicates significant test results. Statistics presented in *Italic* type imply comparisons that do not achieve significance. The particular tests calculated follow typical usage, but non-parametric tests were used for percent rent increase distributions.

TABLE 4.1

SAMPLE SIZES AND COMPLETION RATES

Municipality	Number of Interviews	Completion Rate	
		Overall Completion Rate (%)	Adjusted for non-qualifiers (%)
Metro Toronto	765	76	66
Hamilton	611	82	72
London	729	85	78
Windsor	742	86	76
Ottawa	661	82	76
Thunder Bay	737	87	81
Sudbury	876	89	82

TABLE 4.2

APPROXIMATE PRECISION OF PERCENTAGE ESTIMATES
(In Percentage points at 95% Confidence Level)

Percentage Estimates Near	<u>S a m p l e S i z e</u>							
	<u>1200</u>	<u>1000</u>	<u>800</u>	<u>600</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>50</u>
5	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.7	2.1	3.0	*	*
10	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.5	3.0	4.2	6.0	*
20	2.3	2.5	2.8	3.3	4.0	5.7	8.0	*
30	2.6	2.9	3.2	3.8	4.6	6.5	9.2	12.8
40	2.8	3.1	3.5	4.0	4.9	6.9	9.8	13.7
50	2.9	3.2	3.6	4.1	5.0	7.1	10.0	14.0
60	2.8	3.1	3.5	4.0	4.9	6.9	9.8	13.7
70	2.6	2.9	3.2	3.8	4.6	6.5	9.2	12.8
80	2.3	2.5	2.8	3.3	4.0	5.7	8.0	*
90	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.5	3.0	4.2	6.0	*
95	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.7	2.1	3.0	*	*

* Approximations cannot be made.

Example:

Table 3.1 indicates that 29.8% of Toronto tenants, who have elevators in their buildings, reported a breakdown of elevator services within the past year. The approximate precision is obtained by selecting the value (4.6) at the intersection of the 30% estimate row and 400

sample size column. The approximate estimate precision is $29.8 \pm 4.6\%$, and only a 5% chance exists that the true percentage is not between 25.2% and 34.4%. Of course, the range is smaller if one is willing to risk a greater than 5% chance of error.

TABLE 4.3

OCTOBER, 1980 AVERAGE RENTS BY BEDROOM COUNT
WITH DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Municipality	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	All Units
Metro Toronto				
- Avg. Rent/Precision	\$275 \pm 8.19	\$338 \pm 11.18	\$421 \pm 24.56	\$315 \pm 7.85
- Standard Deviation*/Sample Size	71.06/289	97.80/294	122.19/95	110.61/763
Hamilton				
- Avg. Rent/Precision	\$204 \pm 6.22	\$239 \pm 7.20	\$282 \pm 14.42	\$232 \pm 5.71
- Standard Deviation*/Sample Size	47.96/228	58.25/251	68.99/88	72.00/611
London				
- Avg. Rent/Precision	\$219 \pm 6.18	\$269 \pm 9.29	\$300 \pm 12.13	\$257 \pm 5.93
- Standard Deviation*/Sample Size	48.75/239	83.57/311	66.64/116	81.65/729
Windsor				
- Avg. Rent/Precision	\$226 \pm 8.55	\$269 \pm 10.77	\$284 \pm 13.94	\$253 \pm 6.38
- Standard Deviation*/Sample Size	72.47/276	93.21/288	79.80/126	88.69/742
Ottawa				
- Avg. Rent/Precision	\$253 \pm 7.80	\$297 \pm 9.71	\$344 \pm 7.74	\$295 \pm 7.39
- Standard Deviation*/Sample Size	54.97/191	76.08/236	101.54/151	96.94/661
Thunder Bay				
- Avg. Rent/Precision	\$225 \pm 8.85	\$281 \pm 5.57	\$300 \pm 16.41	\$262 \pm 6.49
- Standard Deviation*/Sample Size	69.70/238	73.90/286	101.50/147	89.79/736
Sudbury				
- Avg. Rent/Precision	\$186 \pm 7.16	\$214 \pm 6.58	\$245 \pm 10.58	\$213 \pm 4.77
- Standard Deviation*/Sample Size	59.24/263	65.04/375	74.02/188	71.95/875

*Standard deviations are measures of dispersion that indicate how closely cases cluster around the average. However, the standard deviation is a mathematical quantity that is useful in calculating various statistical tests. No convenient intuitive interpretation can be stated, but the measure represents something like the average difference between rent levels for each unit and the average rent level.

TABLE 4.4

SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY BEDROOM COUNT

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Room and Bachelor</u> <u>(%)</u>	<u>One Bedroom</u> <u>(%)</u>	<u>Two Bedroom</u> <u>(%)</u>	<u>Three or More Bedroom</u> <u>(%)</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>(%)</u>	<u>Sample Size</u>
Metro Toronto	9.1	37.8	38.7	14.4	100	765
Hamilton	3.8	37.3	41.1	17.8	100	611
London	4.7	32.8	42.6	19.9	100	729
Windsor	3.6	37.2	38.8	20.4	100	742
Ottawa	6.7	28.9	35.7	28.7	100	661
Thunder Bay	6.0	32.4	38.8	22.8	100	737
Sudbury	1.7	30.0	42.8	25.5	100	876

TABLE 4.5

SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY BUILDING SIZE

Municipality	Six Units or More (%)	Less than Six Units (%)	Total (%)	Sample Size
Metro Toronto	71.1	28.9	100	765
Hamilton	65.0	35.0	100	611
London	55.8	44.2	100	729
Windsor	45.1	54.9	100	742
Ottawa	51.9	48.1	100	661
Thunder Bay	34.5	65.5	100	737
Sudbury	35.6	64.4	100	876

TABLE 4.6

SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY DWELLING TYPE

Municipality	Single Family (%)	Duplex (%)	Row or Townhouse (%)	Room (%)	Apartment or Flat (%)	Mobile (%)	Total (%)	Sample Size
Metro Toronto	7.3	4.3	3.7	2.6	82.1	0.0	100	764
Hamilton	11.6	4.6	6.7	1.5	75.6	0.0	100	611
London	13.4	6.7	11.7	2.1	66.0	0.1	100	729
Windsor	21.7	7.8	7.1	1.5	61.9	0.0	100	742
Ottawa	14.5	4.4	13.6	1.1	66.4	0.0	100	661
Thunder Bay	24.4	6.1	8.4	2.2	58.1	0.8	100	737
Sudbury	23.0	8.1	5.5	0.8	61.9	0.7	100	876

